01-06-05

AF/$

Atty Dkt. No. 035774-0103 (f/k/a 070156-0148)

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicants: Adams, et al.

Title: System For And Method Of Adjusting Tempo To Match Audio Events To Video Events Or Other Audio Events In A Recorded Signal

Appl. No.: 09/882,646

Filing Date: 06/15/2001

Examiner: Thai, Cuong T.

Art Unit: 2173

CERTIFICATE OF EXPRESS MAILING
I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service's "Express Mail Post Office To Addressee" service under 37 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated below and is addressed to: **Commissioner for Patents, PO Box 1450, Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450.**

EV 425130020 US (Express Mail Label Number) January 4, 2005 (Date of Deposit)

Nancy L. Kimball (Printed Name)

Nancy L Kimball (Signature)

BRIEF ON APPEAL

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

This Appeal Brief is being filed in triplicate together with a check in the amount of $250.00 covering the Rule 17(c) appeal fee. If this fee is deemed to be insufficient, authorization is hereby given to charge any deficiency (or credit any balance) to deposit account 50-2350.

This paper is being filed in response to the final Office Action dated November 9, 2004, finally rejecting Claims 1-26. The Notice of Appeal was filed on December 20, 2004. Appellants respectfully request reconsideration of the application.

01/07/2005 AWONDAF1 00000024 09882646
01 FC:1402 500.00 OP

REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application has been assigned of record to Sony Pictures Digital, Inc., having a place of business at 10202 W. Washington Blvd., Culver City, CA 90232. The assignment was recorded in the records of the United States Patent and Trademark Office at Reel/Frame 014441/0734 on September 2, 2003.

RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

There are no related appeals or interferences.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

This is an appeal from the final Office Action dated November 9, 2004, finally rejecting Claims 1-26. Claims 1-26 are therefore on appeal.

STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

No claims have been amended in the present application subsequent to the receipt of the final Office Action dated November 9, 2004.

SUMMARY OF INVENTION

The present application relates to computerized signal processing methods and systems. The techniques described adjust the tempo of an audio recording to match audio events to events in an audio-visual recording. In an exemplary embodiment described in the present application, a reference or marker is received that indicates a location in a recorded signal where an audio segment is desired. A tempo is provided for the audio segment such that the audio segment fits within the section defined by the reference or marker. (See present application, page 3, paragraph [0008] – [0009].)

For purposes of illustration, Figure 1 in the present application includes a video file 122 with video frames depicted graphically on a track in track section 120. Audio files 124, 126, and 128 are also represented graphically on tracks in track section 120. A time

marker 170 can be provided to indicate a desired location in the audio or video in which an particular audio segment should fit. If time marker 170 marks a video frame that occurs 7.007 seconds into the video from the start, audio for that section is adjusted to have a tempo that fits the audio section into the marked section of video. For instance, audio file 124 in Figure 1 is adjusted to the section of video file 122 marked by time marker 170. Figure 2 shows the audio file 124 after the tempo has been adjusted to fit the audio file 124 within the segment of video file 122 marked by time market 170. One result from the tempo adjustment is to match audio to video. (See present application, page 9, paragraphs [0031] – [0032]; see also Fig. 1.) Accordingly, a person can coordinate audio or music with specific sections of video.

ISSUES

In the Office Action dated November 9, 2004, Claims 1-26 were rejected as unpatentably obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,642,171 (Baumgartner et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,396 (Boezeman et al.). The overall issue on appeal is whether the Office Action has established a prima facie case of obviousness. The underlying issues are whether there is any suggestion or motivation to combine the Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. references and whether the Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. references, alone or in combination, teach or suggest all of the limitations of Claims 1-26.

GROUPING OF CLAIMS

The grouping of the claims is as follows:

Claims 1, 10, 15, and 21 are independent. Claims 2-9 are dependent on Claim 1, adding further features to Claim 1. Claims 11-14 are dependent on Claim 10, adding further features to Claim 10. Claims 16-20 are dependent on Claim 15, adding further features to Claim 15. Claims 22-26 are dependent on Claim 21, adding further features to Claim 21.

Claims 1-9 are grouped together as being directed to a method of matching audio events to other audio or video.

Claims 10-20 are grouped together as being directed to a system for adjusting tempo of an audio segment to fit the audio segment to a marked section in a recorded signal.

Claims 21-26 are grouped together as being directed to a graphical user interface configured to provide for the creation of an audio visual production.

To the extent that the claims in these groups are argued separately below, the claims do not stand or fall together.

ARGUMENT

I. LEGAL STANDARD FOR OBVIOUSNESS

In the present application, Claims 1-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), which states:

> A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The legal standards under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are well-settled. Obviousness under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) involves four factual inquiries: (1) the scope and content of the prior art; (2) the differences between the claims and the prior art; (3) the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art; and (4) secondary considerations, if any, of nonobviousness. See Graham v. John Deere Co., 383 U.S. 1, 148 U.S.P.Q. 459 (1966).

In proceedings before the Patent and Trademark Office, the Examiner bears the burden of establishing a prima facie case of obviousness based upon the prior art. In re Piasecki, 745 F.2d 1468, 1471-72, 223 U.S.P.Q. 785, 787-88 (Fed. Cir. 1984). "'[The Examiner] can satisfy this burden only by showing some objective teaching in the prior art or that knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.'" In re Fritch, 972 F.2d 1260, 1265, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1780, 1783 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

As noted by the Federal Circuit, the "factual inquiry whether to combine references must be thorough and searching." McGinley v. Franklin Sports, Inc., 262 F.3d 1339, 60 USPQ.2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 2001). Further, it "must be based on objective evidence

of record." In re Lee, 277 F.3d 1338, 61 USPQ.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 2002). The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination must be found in the prior art, and not in the applicant's disclosure. In re Vaeck, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ.2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991). The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. In re Mills, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990). "It is improper, in determining whether a person of ordinary skill would have been led to this combination of references, simply to '[use] that which the inventor taught against its teacher.'" Lee (citing W.L. Gore v. Garlock, Inc., 721 F.2d 1540, 1553, 220 USPQ 303, 312-13 (Fed. Cir. 1983)).

II. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-26 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In Section 4 of the Office Action dated November 9, 2004, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,642,171 to Baumgartner et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,188,396 to Boezeman et al. This rejection is the only rejection made by the Examiner. Further, Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. are the only references cited by the Examiner to support the rejection. For the reasons given below, the Appellants submit that the Examiner's rejection of Claims 1-26 is improper and should be reversed.

A. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-20 Should be Reversed Because Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. do not Combine to Teach or Suggest All of the Claim Limitations

An obviousness rejection cannot be properly maintained where the references used in the rejection do not disclose all of the recited claim elements. Independent claims 1, 10, and

15 all require "tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal." Specifically, Claim 1 recites:

> providing a tempo for an audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

Claim 10 recites:

> means for providing a tempo for an audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording segment to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

Claim 15 recites:

> provide a tempo for an audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording segment to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

Neither Baumgartner et al. nor Boezeman et al. disclose, suggest, or teach "the tempo being **adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal** marked by the reference." The Examiner disagrees. In the Office Action, the Examiner argues:

> ... since while Baumgartner discloses the limitation of the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording as the technique of the method adjusts the audio tempo to maintain synchronization (see col. 6, lines 60-61) or of the method of maintains synchronization by adjusting audio tempo (see col. 12, lines 40-41). Baumgartner lacks of providing a tempo for an audio to be at least partially included in the recording signal.
>
> Boezeman, on the other hand, discloses the limitation of providing a tempo for an audio to be at least partially included in the recording signal, the tempo to fit the audio recording section of the recorded signal marked by the reference as the technique of a Sequence Editor which during the course of the animation, a pieces of audio is also played. At the simulation ending of the animation and audio, a video plays (see col. 6, lines 58-62 and see Fig. 3-17). Specially, the synchronization of the audio and the animation via the co-occur tool in an implementation of specifying both the starting and ending time

> of the audio with respect to the animation. The synchronization of the video and animation via the meet tool is an implementation of specifying the starting of the video with respect to the ending time of the animation (see Boezeman's col. 8, lines 34-40). **Thus by using Boezeman's graphically Sequence Editor as a reference mark; Audio, Video, Animation, Events, and Images can be synchronized with respect to starting time and ending time which allows the developer a great deal of flexibility. The sequence editor, in turn, would provide for the developer a view of the multimedia events from the perspective of its time structure as opposed to available data flow or user interface perspective.**

(Office Action, pages 19-20, boldface in original, underlining added.)

As such, it appears that the Examiner is relying on col. 8, lines 34-40 in Boezeman et al. and the description of the "co-occur" tool. The "co-occur" tool, according to Boezeman et al., "causes two parts to automatically start and stop at the same time." (Boezeman et al., Col. 2, lines 54-55.) However, the "co-occur" tool described in Boezeman et al. performs a completely different operation than that recited in Claims 1, 10, and 15. Col. 7, lines 55-65 of Boezeman et al. states:

> As was stated in the real world example above, the animation and audio were to start and stop at the same time. By utilizing the present invention, the developer may simply ensure that this occurs. Referring to FIG. 10, by selecting first the animation player play area 131 and then the audio player play area 143 and then the co-occur tool 70, **it is ensured that the animation player part and the audio player part will start and stop simultaneously**. Since the audio was only about 30 seconds in length, **the audio will obviously have to be replayed** to reach the 100 second length of the animation.

(emphasis added.) Thus, Boezeman et al. does not make any adjustments to the tempo of the audio to have it fit within a section of animation, rather the audio is "replayed" so that the time duration of the audio matches that of the animation. While the **duration** of audio (i.e.,

the number of times the audio is played) may be adjusted by the system described in Boezeman et al., there is no discussion or suggestion of adjusting the **tempo** of the audio.

In sum, the Examiner admits that "Baumgartner lacks of providing a tempo for an audio to be at least partially included in the recording signal." (Office Action, page 19.) The only other reference cited by the Examiner in support of the rejection, Boezeman et al., also fails to disclose or suggest "tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal," as required by Claim 1. As indicated above, an obviousness rejection cannot be properly maintained where the references used in the rejection do not disclose all of the recited claim elements. Claims 2-9 depend from Claim 1, Claims 11-14 depend from Claim 10, and Claims 16-20 depend from Claim 15. Claims 1-20, thus, all require "tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection and allowance of Claims 1-20.

B. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 21-26 Should be Reversed Because Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. do not Combine to Teach or Suggest All of the Claim Limitations

Claims 21-26 also require claim limitations not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al.. Independent claim 21 requires "the reference marker being used to adjust the tempo of at least a portion of the first audio recording." Specifically, Claim 21 recites:

> a reference marker which is configured to be selectively located by a user, the reference marker being used to **adjust the tempo** of at least a portion of the first audio recording, the **tempo adjustment being provided to fit the first audio recording to a section of the second audio or video recording**.

As discussed in Section A above with reference to Claims 1-20, neither Baumgartner et al. nor Boezeman et al. disclose, suggest, or teach **adjusting** the tempo of at least a portion

of an audio recording to "fit the first audio recording to a section of the second audio or video recording." In the Office Action, the Examiner points to Figure 10 of Boezeman et al. as showing the fitting of a first audio recording to a section of a second audio or video recording. (See Office Action, page 5.) However, Figure 10 illustrates the operation of the "co-occur" tool, which—as explained above—does not "fit" the audio by adjusting the tempo. The "co-occur" tool fits the audio to a section by **replaying the audio** as many times as is necessary to match the recordings. Boezeman et al. describes repeating an audio segment 3.3 times to fill an entire 100 second length of animation. (See Boezeman et al., Col. 7, lines 61-65 and Fig. 10.) The tempo is **not** adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference as recited, for example, by Claim 21.

Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. fail to combine to disclose, suggest, or teach **adjusting** the tempo of at least a portion of an audio recording to "fit the first audio recording to a section of the second audio or video recording." Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of Claim 21 and its dependent claims, Claims 22-26.

C. The Examiner's Rejection of Claims 1-26 Should be Reversed Because There is No Suggestion to Combine the Teachings of Baumgartner et al. with Those of Boezeman et al.

To establish a prima facie case of obviousness based on a combination of prior art references under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), the Examiner must first show that there is a suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of those references. This may come in the form of some objective teaching in the prior art or, alternatively, knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that would lead that individual to combine the relevant teachings of the references.

When the motivation to combine the teachings of the references is not immediately apparent, it is the duty of the Examiner to explain why the combination of the teachings is proper. Ex parte Skinner, 2 USPQ.2d 1788 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1986). In this case, the Examiner has not shown – and indeed, cannot show – that there would have been any motivation or suggestion to one of skill in the art to combine the teachings of Boezeman et al. and Baumgartner et al. In support of the obviousness rejection, the Examiner states:

> It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include Boezeman's teachings of providing a tempo for an audio to be at least partially included in the recording signal, the tempo to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference into that of Baumgartner's adjusted tempo invention. By doing so, the system would be enhanced by providing a **graphically editor** to an end user wherein the user can **graphically perform editing and synchronizing** audio and video as well as animation tool based on user's desired taste.

(Page 18 of the Office Action, dated November 9, 2004, boldface in original.) Appellants respectfully disagree. Neither reference provides a suggestion to combine the processing technique of Baumgartner et al. and the multi-media editor of Boezeman et al.

Boezeman et al. describes a multimedia application that a human application developer might use to create a production "from parts on a scene that have been selected previously." (Col. 5, lines 40-41). Boezeman et al. states:

> The sequence editor is a mechanism that allows a user to synchronize relative time, absolute time and event time together in an easy to use manner. **The solution assumes that items for synchronization (such as an animation, video, audio, image) have been previously identified and selected by a user**.

(Boezeman et al., Col. 5, lines 47-52, Emphasis added). Boezeman et al. requires interaction with the user to operate. (See, for example, Boezeman et al., Col. 7, lines 5-6, lines 11-13,

lines 23-25, lines 32-33, lines 41-43, and lines 52-53.) The user of the system described by Boezeman et al. selects saved multimedia files and builds a new production from them. Instead of relying on a developer to build a new production as described in Boezeman et al., Baumgartner et al. describes a computer system that "synchronizes the audio and video data streams **during** a multimedia presentation to ensure that the appropriate sounds are generated by the speaker 132 when the corresponding images are being displayed by the video monitor 122." (Baumgartner et al., Col. 9, lines 9-13).

As a result of their fundamental differences, Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. cannot work together in combination. First, the principal of operation of one is completely different than the principal of operation of the other. Baumgartner et al. automates the synchronization of audio and video data streams during a presentation—avoiding the use of human interaction. Boezeman et al. enables users to create a production from existing multimedia files—enhancing the functionality available using human interaction. Second, a person of skill in the art would not combine a reference describing a production system used to create a presentation (Boezeman et al.) with a reference describing a "method for synchronizing the audio and video data streams **during** a multimedia presentation." (Baumgartner et al., Col. 7, lines 25-27, emphasis added.)

In conclusion, Appellants respectfully submit that there is no suggestion or motivation to combine the teachings of Baumgartner et al. and Boezeman et al. to obtain the subject matter recited in claims 1-26. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-26 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, the Appellants submit that:

Claims 1-26 are not properly rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over the combination of Baumgartner et al., and Boezeman et al. and are patentable.

Accordingly, Appellants respectfully request that the Board reverse all claim rejections and indicate that a Notice of Allowance respecting all pending claims should be issued.

Respectfully submitted,

Date January 4, 2005

By _____

Paul S. Hunter
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 44,787

FOLEY & LARDNER LLP
Customer Number: 23524
Telephone: (608) 258-4292
Facsimile: (608) 258-4258

APPENDIX – THE CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A method of adjusting tempo of an audio recording to match audio events to video or other audio events in an audio-visual recording, the method comprising:

receiving a reference indicating a location in a recorded signal, the reference being indicative of a desired audio tempo change location in the recorded signal; and

providing a tempo for an audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

2. The method of claim 1, wherein the reference is indicative of a time location in the recorded signal to coincide a musical event with a particular frame of video in the recorded signal.

3. The method of claim 1, wherein the reference is indicative of a location in the audio recording to be synchronized with a cursor time reference located in the recorded signal.

4. The method of claim 1, further comprising providing a user interface via a computing device, the user interface providing graphical representations of the recorded signal and of the audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal.

5. The method of claim 4, wherein the graphical representations include an audio waveform, wherein the user interface provides for the selective manipulation of characteristics of the audio waveform.

6. The method of claim 5, wherein the selective manipulation provided by user interface includes providing for the increase in length of the audio waveform, thereby increasing the duration of the audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal.

7. The method of claim 1, wherein the step of providing a tempo for an audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal comprises receiving a indication of a beginning and an end of the audio recording segment.

8. The method of claim 1, further comprising displaying video thumbnails of video images in the recorded signal on a user interface, the user interface having time indications labeling the video thumbnails according to timing of appearance of video images in the recorded signal.

9. The method of claim 8, further comprising displaying audio representations of the audio recording to be at least partially included in the recorded signal, the audio representations being labeled with the time indications.

10. In a computer program product, a system of determining the tempo of a portion of music such that one tempo phrase ends and another tempo phrase begins at a frame of video or portion of audio as desired by a user of the computer program product, the system comprising:

means for receiving a reference indicating a location in a recorded signal; and

means for providing a tempo for an audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording segment to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

11. The system of claim 10, further comprising means for interfacing with a computing device, the interfacing means being configured to provide graphical representations of the recorded signal including video images and of the audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal.

12. The system of claim 10, wherein the means of providing a tempo for an audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal comprises means for receiving a indication of a beginning and an end of the audio recording segment.

13. The system of claim 10, further comprising means for displaying video thumbnails of video images in the recorded signal on a means for interfacing with a computing device, the interface means having time indications labeling the video thumbnails according to timing of appearance of video images in the video.

14. The system of claim 13, further comprising means for displaying audio representations of the audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal, the audio representations being labeled with the time indications.

15. A processing system comprising:

a central processing unit (CPU); and

a storage device coupled to a processor and having stored there information for configuring the CPU to:

receive a reference indicating a location in a recorded signal; and

provide a tempo for an audio recording segment to be included in the recorded signal, the tempo being adjusted to fit the audio recording segment to a section of the recorded signal marked by the reference.

16. The system of claim 15, further comprising a presentation device, wherein the presentation device is configured to provide a graphical user interface which presents portions of the recorded signal and the audio recording segment.

17. The system of claim 15, further comprising an interface device configured to connect the CPU with a network of computers.

18. The system of claim 15, wherein the storage device having stored files containing video image information.

19. The system of claim 15, wherein the CPU is further configured to assign the provided tempo to the audio recording segment.

20. The system of claim 15, wherein the CPU is further configured to save a file to the storage device, the file including information related to the video, the audio recording segment, and the provided tempo.

21. A graphical user interface configured to display representations of audio signals and video signals and being further configured to provide for creation of an audio or

an audio visual production using a plurality of audio or video recordings, the graphical user interface comprising:

a first graphical display area on which graphical representations of a first audio recording can be displayed;

a second graphical display area on which graphical representations of a second audio or video recording can be displayed; and

a reference marker which is configured to be selectively located by a user, the reference marker being used to adjust the tempo of at least a portion of the first audio recording, the tempo adjustment being provided to fit the first audio recording to a section of the second audio or video recording.

22. The graphical user interface of claim 21, wherein the reference marker is a location marker indicating a measure location in the first audio recording.

23. The graphical user interface of claim 22, wherein the tempo adjustment is performed using the reference marker in the first audio recording and a cursor position in the second audio or video recording.

24. The graphical user interface of claim 21, wherein the reference marker is a time marker indicating a time location in the second audio or video recording.

25. The graphical user interface of claim 24, wherein the tempo adjustment is performed using the reference marker in the second audio or video recording and a cursor position in the first audio recording.

26. The graphical user interface of claim 24, wherein the tempo adjustment is performed using the reference marker in the second audio or video recording and a position in the first audio recording to which a user drags the reference marker.

PATENT APPLICATION

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant(s): Dennis J. Adams

Serial No.: 09/882,646

Filed: 6/15/2001

Title: SYSTEM FOR AND METHOD OF ADJUSTING TEMPO TO MATCH AUDIO EVENTS TO VIDEO EVENTS OR OTHER AUDIO EVENTS IN A RECORDED SIGNAL

Docket No.: 035774-0103 (f/k/a 070156-0148)

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313

"Express Mail" Mailing Label No.: EV 425130020 US
Date of Deposit: January 4, 2005

I hereby certify that these attached documents:

*Brief on Appeal (in triplicate)
*Check No. 34475; $500.00
*Return Postcard

are being deposited with the United States Postal Service "Express Mail Post Office to Addressee" service under 35 C.F.R. § 1.10 on the date indicated above and is addressed to Commissioner for Patents, U. S. Patent and Trademark Office, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Enclosed for filing please find the above-referenced documents. Please indicate receipt of these documents by returning the attached postcard with the official Patent and Trademark Office receipt stamped thereon.

Nancy L. Kimball

Nancy L. Kimball
Foley & Lardner LLP
P. O. Box 1497
Madison, Wisconsin 53701-1497
(608) 257-5035